

**CALIFORNIA  
COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING**

**May 7-8, 2003  
In-Folder**

**AGENDA ITEM NUMBER:**      **LEG-2**

**COMMITTEE:**                      **LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE**

**TITLE:**                              **ANALYSES OF BILLS OF INTEREST TO THE  
COMMISSION**

  XX        **Action**

            **Information**

**Strategic Plan Goal(s):**

**Continue effective and appropriate involvement of the Commission with policy makers on key education issues.**

**Presented By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Linda G. Bond, Director**  
                                 **Office of Governmental Relations**

**Prepared By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Dan Gonzales, Analyst**  
                                 **Office of Governmental Relations**

**Prepared By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Anne Padilla, Consultant**  
                                 **Office of Governmental Relations**

**Prepared By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Leyne Milstein, Director**  
                                 **Information Technology & Support Management**

**Prepared By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Marilyn Errett, Administrator**  
                                 **Office of Governmental Relations**

**Approved By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Linda G. Bond, Director**  
                                 **Office of Governmental Relations**

**Authorized By:**                      \_\_\_\_\_                      **Date: May 2, 2003**  
                                 **Sam W. Swofford, Ed.D.**  
                                 **Executive Director**

## **Bill Analysis**

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 424</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Richman</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Revision of the Education Code</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 14, 2003</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Committee on Education</b>
<b>Current CCTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Seek Amendments</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 18, 2003</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Dan Gonzales</b>

#### **Summary of Current Law**

The Education Code governs childcare and development services, elementary and secondary education, and teacher credentialing. Chapters in the Education Code also prescribe the duties and responsibilities of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the State Department of Education, the Commission on Teacher Credentialing, school districts, county offices of education, special education local plan areas, and charter schools.

**Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education.** The Joint Committee to Develop a Master Plan for Education – Kindergarten through University submitted a Master Plan for Education for California’s next generation of students. The Committee addressed a broad range of issues - teaching and learning, enrollment, funding and governance - across all systems of education. The Committee introduced eight bills this year based on the Committee’s recommendations.

#### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

**AB 424** would establish a commission to revise large sections of the Education Code, called articles or chapters, that would be automatically repealed. The chapter governing the Commission and the credentialing of educators would be one of those repealed.

**Specifically, this measure would:**

- Repeal over 63 chapters and sections of the Education Code on July 1, 2007. This bill would repeal the chapters governing teacher credentialing and child care and development, including the Commission's authority to issue Child Development Permits. This measure would also repeal the chapters on school employees, school bonds, school buses, education in state prisons, interscholastic athletics, school safety, violence prevention, and many others.
- Establish a 15-member commission to revise the to-be-repealed chapters and sections. The revision commission could appoint advisory committees, as needed, and would submit a revised version of the Education Code to the Legislature, the Governor, and the State Board of Education on or before January 1, 2005.
- Appoint the Superintendent of Public Instruction as a voting ex officio member of the revision commission. The Governor and the Superintendent of Public Instruction could appoint three members each. The Chairs and Vice-chairs of the Assembly Committee on Education and the Senate Committee on Education could each appoint one member. The State Board of Education, the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Committee on Rules, and the Secretary for Education could also appoint one member each.
- Require the members of the revision commission to serve without compensation. They could be reimbursed for all necessary expenses incurred in the performance of their duties.
- Specify that the commission may only revise the chapters and sections that would be repealed.
- Require the Legislative Counsel, Legislative Analyst, State Department of Education, and the Department of Finance to use existing resources to assist the revision commission.

**Comments.**

**Purpose.** According to the intent language in the bill, this measure would complement the efficient and effective implementation of the Joint Master Plan for Education. The Master Plan Committee does not sponsor this measure and the author is not a member of the Master Plan Committee.

**Repealed law may not be replaced.** Under this measure, the chapter governing teacher credentialing and child development permits could be repealed without a replacement being enacted. As a result, teachers would not receive the credentials they earned; continuation of state funded teacher internship programs or certificates would be jeopardized. More importantly, the law governing the suspension or revocation of credentials for individuals convicted of crimes such as sexual abuse, murder, or child abuse would cease to exist.

**Process not typical.** The process in this measure is different than the process the Legislature usually uses to revise significant parts of the law. Typically, the Legislature first studies an issue and holds hearings where interested parties may testify. Then, the Legislature passes legislation repealing the old law and enacting the new law. This process prevents a lapse in the law.

**Unintended consequences.** Repealing and enacting dozens of chapters and sections may have unintended consequences. For example, sections in the Education Code or other Codes could refer to laws that no longer exist or that have been completely rewritten.

### **Fiscal Analysis**

This measure would not have any direct fiscal impact on the Commission.

### **Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission**

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**

**4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**

**5. The Commission supports legislation which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### **Organizational Positions on the Bill**

#### Support

No known support on this version of the bill.

#### Oppose

No known opposition on this version of the bill.

### **Suggested Amendments**

Commission staff recommends amendments to ensure the Commission still can continue to serve current and prospective teachers, school districts and the public until and unless a replacement law is enacted. The provision calling for automatic repeal of specified chapters should be deleted to ensure continuity of the law. Instead, the proposal could call on the revision commission to review and recommend changes to the chapters specified in the bill.

**Reason for Suggested Position**

**SEEK AMENDMENTS** – Commission staff recommends a "seek amendments" position to ensure the Commission can still fulfill its legislative mandate and to ensure that teachers, school districts, and the public are not adversely impacted.



## **Bill Analysis**

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 791</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Pavley</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Merger of Commission on Teacher Credentialing and Department of Education</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2003</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Assembly Appropriations Committee</b>
<b>Current CCTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Seek Amendments</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>March 28, 2003</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Anne L. Padilla</b>

#### **Summary of Current Law**

**The Commission.** Teachers were first licensed at the county level. In the 1930's California began to license teachers at the state level at the Department of Education. In 1970, the California Legislature and Governor created a permanent, independent commission to strengthen the effectiveness of teachers and teacher education in the state. Originally named the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, the agency was renamed the Commission on Teacher Credentialing in 1983. In 1988, the Legislature strengthened the Commission's autonomy as the state's primary agency for implementing educator preparation and licensing laws, by removing the requirement that Title 5 regulations governing teacher licensing be reviewed and approved by the State Board of Education.

The Commission is the oldest of the state standards boards in the country. The Commission is an instrument of the Legislature in implementing laws related to educator preparation and licensing; accredits over eighty four-year private and public colleges and universities; licenses K-12 public educators; and takes adverse action on credential and license holders pursuant to specific provisions of the Education Code.

**Department of Education.** The Department of Education, under the direction of the State Board of Education and the Superintendent of Public Instruction, administers California's public education system at the state level. California currently educates approximately 6.2 million students from infants to adults.

**Legislative Analyst's Office.** The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) provides fiscal and policy advice to the Legislature. The Joint Legislative Budget Committee, a 16-member, bipartisan committee oversees the LAO. The LAO ensures that the executive branch implements legislative policy in a cost efficient and effective manner by reviewing and analyzing the operations and finances of state government.

### **Summary of Current Activity by the Commission**

*MGT Study:* The 1999 State Budget included a provision that required the transfer of up to \$250,000 from the Teacher Credentials Fund to the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) for the purpose of contracting for a comprehensive management study of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing's (CCTC) organizational structure and credential processing protocols. The LAO contracted with MGT of America to complete the study. The study was, at a minimum, to review the following:

- Identification of regulations and statutes related to teacher credentialing that may be modified to improve the efficient processing of credentials;
- Evaluation of the extent to which the CCTC's information technology plans achieve improvements in efficiency and timeliness in credential processing and other service areas and recommendations for further improvement in this area;
- Recommendations regarding the appropriate level of staff to process credentials in an efficient and timely manner;
- Recommendations for any customer service improvements, including, but not limited to, accessibility;
- Recommendations for an appropriate credential fee structure to support the CCTC's average cost to process a credential, including the costs of potential discipline review, professional standards development, institutional accreditation, and agency administration; and
- Recommendations for further topics of study.

The study was released on March 1, 2000 to the Legislature and the Governor by the LAO. The study revealed no major structural issues for the CCTC, but proposed 32 recommendations that could generally be divided into three categories: 1) those that the CCTC could implement given sufficient resources (18 recommendations); 2) those that require the coordination and cooperation of other agencies (6 recommendations); and 3) those where costs may outweigh the benefits (8 recommendations).

The primary recommendations proposed by the study were to reduce application turn-around time, expand web-site capabilities, improve readability of CCTC publications and forms, and maintain the current standard of customer service. MGT noted that the Commission has implemented numerous technological and procedural changes in the past several years that have enabled the Commission to cope with the unprecedented workload demands imposed by Class Size Reduction during a time when resource levels remained relatively stable.



In addition, the study found that the Commission had improved customer satisfaction and continues to work toward implementing customer-driven solutions. Finally, the study confirmed that the Commission's current credential application fee level appears reasonable and appropriate.

The study also recommended that the Commission consider pursuing several business process changes that could result in a modest improvement in credentialing processing times and customer service levels. MGT also suggested that the Commission could improve its operations through both staff increases and the further application of information technology.

The LAO's final report on the study, *Commission on Teacher Credentialing: Efforts to Implement Management Study Reforms*, noted that the Commission had undertaken several initiatives in response to the report's recommendations; considerable progress had been made in developing an updated technology improvement plan and in restructuring the credential analysts' training program. Some efforts, however, were in preliminary stages of implementation and the LAO recommended that the Commission report on the progress of these efforts at the end of the year. The Commission complied with this reporting request and continues to make improvements in services to its constituency.

*CAW Customer Service Survey:* The Certification, Assignment and Waiver Division annually responds to over 260,000 phone calls, processes over 226,000 applications for credentials, receives approximately 33,000 e-mails and 8,000 letters. As a part of the Commission's ongoing commitment to high quality customer service, several customer service surveys were developed and implemented during fiscal year 2000-01. During fiscal year 2001-02, (the latest available survey data) three separate surveys were conducted including an application processing survey, an ongoing front office (walk-in) survey and an e-mail survey. In response to overall customer satisfaction (all survey types), 81.5 percent rated the Commission's overall service as "above average" or "excellent."

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

This measure would require the Legislative Analyst's Office to:

- Review the success of the Commission in performing its assigned functions.
- Assess the feasibility of merging the Commission with the Department of Education.
- Submit the report on its findings and recommendations to the Legislature and the Governor by July 1, 2004.

### **Comments**

*Reasons for mergers:* Organizations merge for several reasons. The benefits of a combined organization may be cost savings due to efficiencies or economies of scale, increased revenue, increased market share, or improved service to its customers or clients. Cost savings may result from eliminating or consolidating programs, eliminating or reducing duplicative administrative functions, or cutting operating

budgets. However, any cost savings must be offset by the cost to merge. Merger costs include the costs to integrate systems, such as telecommunications, computer, administrative, and others. There may also be costs to eliminate, reduce or consolidate programs or administrative functions.

According to research on mergers, many mergers do not realize all the anticipated benefits. The most successful mergers are those in which the merging organization's missions are similar, the organizations are geographically close, they share the same clients, and goals, offer similar services and when both organizations support the merger.

Moving the Commission would involve both short-term (moving and administrative) and long-term (existing lease obligations; new lease obligations at CDE which would cost two times the existing; increased administrative costs relative to existing State Board and CDE indirect costs). Any savings (eliminating duplicative administrative infrastructure) would be outweighed by both short-term and long-term cost increases. In addition, embedding the CTC in the CDE would lead to fund "bleeding"-- it would no longer be easy to trace funds generated by teacher credential applications or test fees. (See fiscal analysis below.)

*National Trends:* The trend nationally is toward independent standards boards, to give appropriate attention to the issues of teacher standards, program accreditation, "reciprocity" and fitness.

*Workload:* Ten times a year the Commission meets to review issues involving the safety of children, teacher preparation standards, and program approvals. Can the State Board schedule another full day or two of work each month to address matters that require deliberation by a representative board, particularly with respect to teacher discipline? Alternatively, can/should a Superintendent of Public Instruction be responsible for teacher discipline appeals?

*Representation:* The Education Code requires the Commission to be comprised of a majority of educators (six teachers and one administrator). Commissioners come from diverse racial, ethnic, geographic, and professional groups. State Board representation does not require teacher representation.

## **Fiscal Analysis**

This measure could have direct fiscal impact on the Commission, in that the required study by the LAO could involve extensive time and effort by CCTC staff. The recent mandated study by the independent consultants involved the equivalent of months of staff time and effort for a variety of CCTC staff to meet with the independent consultants, prepare written materials, gather data and respond to specified questions and numerous requests.

Any estimate of the costs to merge the Commission and the Department of Education would depend on several unknown factors, such as whether the Commission would move to the new Department of Education building and the administrative structure of the merged agency. However, Commission staff has estimated that a merger could result in increased costs of approximately \$2.3 to \$5.4 million annually. These costs

would include moving, increased rent, and administrative fees to the Department of Education and control agencies (detailed fiscal analysis available).

Any merger costs or savings would not impact the General Fund but would impact the teacher credentialing and exams funds.

### **Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission**

The following Legislative policy applies to this measure:

**1. The Commission supports legislation which proposes to maintain or establish high standards for the preparation of public school teachers and other educators in California, and opposes legislation that would lower standards for teachers and other educators.**

**4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates, and opposes legislation which would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.**

**5. The Commission supports legislation, which strengthens or reaffirms initiatives and reforms, which it previously has adopted, and opposes legislation which would undermine initiatives or reforms which it previously has adopted.**

### **Organizational Positions on the Bill**

#### Support

California Catholic Conference  
Los Angeles County Office of Education  
United Teachers of Los Angeles  
California Teachers Association

#### Oppose

California Federation of Teachers  
California School Boards Association  
School District Personnel Administrators of San Bernardino and San Diego Counties

### **Suggested Amendments**

Staff recommends that AB 791 be amended to include an appropriation to cover both LAO and Commission costs associated with the LAO study.

Absent funding for the study, staff recommends that the bill be amended to direct the Commission to make specified improvements, to the extent improvements are not already implemented or underway as a result of the recent LAO study.

### **Reason for Suggested Position**

The proposed study would duplicate the \$250,000 study already funded by teachers credentialing fees.

There is no duplication or overlap between the duties of the CCTC and the duties of the CDE.

Moving the CCTC would entail substantial short-term and long-term costs.

This measure could have direct fiscal impact on the Commission, in that the required study by the LAO could involve extensive time and effort by CCTC staff. The recent mandated study by the independent consultants involved the equivalent of months of staff time and effort for a variety of CCTC staff to meet with the independent consultants, prepare written materials, gather data and respond to specified questions and numerous requests. Given the current job freeze and state cuts to government agencies, the Commission is not able to absorb additional demands on staff time without affecting mandated functions.

## ***Teacher Credentialing and Retention in California--2003 Data AB 791 (Pavley) Attachment***

**Teacher Retention:** *What is the current teacher retention rate in California? Is this rate higher than the national average?*

California teacher retention is significantly higher rate than the national average--after four years, 84% of California teachers remain in the classroom as compared to 67% of U.S. teachers.

Source: California Employment Development Department and California Commission on Teacher Credentialing *Preliminary Study of Teacher Retention in California, 2003*.

**Out-of-State Teachers:** *How have barriers to out of state teachers been removed?*

- Under Commission sponsored legislation in 2000, authored by Senators Scott and O'Connell, California credential requirements are waived for experienced teachers and administrators who have performed successfully in any other state.
- Individuals without experience, but who are eligible for a credential in any state with equivalent requirements do not have to complete duplicative coursework in either subject matter or teacher preparation in California.
- Teachers who have not completed equivalent requirements need only to complete the specific work mandated by law, such as preparation to teach English learners.

Source: AB 877 (Scott and O'Connell, Chapter 703, Statutes of 2000)

**Teachers from California Private Schools:** *How have barriers to private school teachers been removed?*

- Under 2001 legislation authored by Senator Scott and sponsored by the Commission, the requirement for a teacher preparation program is waived entirely for teachers with six years of successful experience in a private school.
- For teachers with three years of successful private school teaching, the student teaching requirement is waived.
- In addition, any teacher in either a public or private school may waive the teacher preparation coursework upon of an exam.

Source: SB 57 (Scott, Chapter 269, Statutes of 2001)

**Number of Credentials Processed in 2001-02: *Has there been an increase in the number of newly credentialed teachers?***

Yes, in fiscal year 2001-02 California saw a 23% increase in teachers newly available to teach – from 23,926 in 2000-01 to 29,536 in 2001-02.

***Has there been a decrease in the number of emergency teaching permits?***

Yes, for the second consecutive year, emergency permits have decreased from the previous fiscal year. In fiscal year 2001-02 there was a 14% decrease from the previous year -- 32,573 in 2000-01 to 28,126 in 2001-02. In two years there has been a 19% decrease.

**How many credentials were issued in 2001-02?**

- 130,597 new applications and 116, 822 renewals were issued for new and renewed credentials were processed.
- In addition, the Commission provided credential-related services to the public by answering 258,652 phone calls, 37,921 e-mail questions and 7,301 letters.

Source: Draft 2001-02 California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Annual Report (Publication pending – May 2003)

**How long does it take to process a credential renewal?**

With the new technology introduced in the past two years, teacher credential renewals take 9 days.

**How do teachers and other rate the service provided by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing?**

During fiscal year 2001-02, (the latest available survey data) three separate surveys were conducted including an application processing survey, an ongoing front office (walk-in) survey and an e-mail survey. In response to overall customer satisfaction (all survey types), **81.5 percent rated the Commission's overall service as "above average" or "excellent."**

**For more detailed information on these issues, see attached.**



## **Bill Analysis**

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Assembly Bill 1650</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Assembly Member Joseph Simitian</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Author</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Professional Development Block Grant</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 21, 2003</b>
<b>Last Amended:</b>	<b>April 28, 2003</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process</b>	<b>Assembly Appropriations Committee (Not Yet Scheduled for Hearing)</b>
<b>Current CTC Position:</b>	<b>None</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Seek Amendments</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 30, 2003</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Leyne Milstein</b>

#### **Summary of Current Law**

Current law provides for a number of teacher preparation and professional development programs. Among these programs are the English Language Acquisition Program (Education Code Section 400), the High School Coaching Education and Training Program (Education Code Sections 35179.1 and 3579.3), the Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (Education Code Section 44279.1), the California Pre-Internship Teaching program (Education Code Section 44305), the Alternative Certification (Intern) program (Education Code Section 44380), the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training program (Education Section 44390), the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification Incentive Program (Education Code Section 44395), the California Mathematics Initiative for Teaching (Education Code Section 44400) the California Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers (Education Code Section 44500), the Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform Program (Education Code Section 44579), the Education Technology Staff Development Program (Education Code Section 44730), Readers for Legally Blind Teachers (Education Code Section 45370), the California Technology Assistance Project (Education Code Section 51871), the Education Technology Professional Development Program (Education Code Section 52272) the California Professional Development Institutes (Education Code Section 99220), the Mathematics and Reading Professional Development Program (Education Section 99230).



**Teacher *preparation*** programs prepare teaching candidates both in subject matter content and teaching skills to serve as newly certificated teachers in California classrooms. Candidates must meet all credential requirements and are authorized to teach in any district in the *state*. **Teacher *professional development*** programs seek to enrich and deepen the skills and knowledge of fully certificated teachers throughout their teaching career. Education Code Section 44277 requires teachers to complete 150 hours of professional development, as specified, every five years for the renewal of a teaching credential.

### **Summary of Current Activity by the Commission**

Currently, the Commission administers the following state funded alternative *preparation* and support grant programs: the California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training Program (Para Program), the Pre-Internship Teaching Program (Pre-Intern Program), the Alternative Certification (Intern) program, the Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment program (BTSA) (jointly administered with the California Department of Education) and the California Mathematics Initiative for Teachers program.

In addition, the Commission issues Pre-Intern certificates, Intern credentials and professional clear teaching credentials to candidates completing requirements and receiving recommendations by those programs.

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

This measure is identical to AB 2120 (Simitian), introduced in February 2002, which was held in the Assembly Appropriations Committee. AB 1650 would consolidate 19 teacher *preparation* and *development* programs with the intent to: 1) streamline programs with similar purposes; 2) simplify the administrative process; 3) provide flexibility to districts; and 4) gain funding efficiencies. The programs targeted for consolidation are:

- English Language Acquisition program;
- High School Coaching Education and Training program;
- Marian Bergeson Beginning Teacher Support and Assessment (BTSA) program;
- California Pre-Internship Teaching program;
- Alternative Certification (Intern) program;
- California School Paraprofessional Teacher Training program;
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification Incentive program;
- California Mathematics Initiative for Teaching program;
- California Peer Assistance and Review Program for Teachers;
- Instructional Time and Staff Development Reform program;
- School Development Plans;
- Education Technology Staff Development program;
- Readers for Legally Blind Teachers;
- California Technology Assistance Project
- Educational Professional Development program;
- California Professional Development Institutes;
- Mathematics and Reading Professional Development program;

- Pre-intern Teaching Academies
- Instructional Support for Secondary Schools in Reading.

This concept was recommended as a part of the Office of the Legislative Analyst's (LAO) *Analysis of the 2002-03 State Budget*. In the *Analysis*, the LAO recommended the establishment of five education block grants that they believe will increase local school district control, encourage more effective use of funds, provide clearer program directives and clearer lines of accountability. AB 1650 contains provisions similar to the LAO's 2002-03 teacher support and development block grant proposal in which the LAO recommended a teacher support and development block grant that would have consolidated 19 existing programs and created a new formula-based block grant with the goal of increased local flexibility and effectiveness to support teacher development.

It is important to note that this year, both the 2003-04 LAO Analysis and the Governor's Budget block grant proposals recognize the distinction between teacher preparation and professional development, and have not included the alternative certification funds administered by the Commission in their block grant proposal. However, BTSA is included in both the Governor's and LAO's block grant proposals.

### **Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill**

The Commission administers approximately \$39 million in grant funds for the Para Program, the Pre-Intern Program, the Intern Program and the California Mathematics Initiative for Teaching program. BTSA, currently funded at \$76 million, is jointly administered with the California Department of Education and is funded through the CDE's budget. AB 1650 specifies that the CDE serve as the administering agency for the proposed block grant. Under this scenario, local assistance funds currently administered by the Commission for credentialing purposes (or for teacher preparation purposes) would be administered by the CDE.

### **Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission**

4. The Commission supports the maintenance of a thoughtful, cohesive approach to the preparation of credential candidates and opposes legislation that would tend to fragment or undermine the cohesiveness of the preparation of credential candidates.

## Organizational Positions on the Bill

The Association of California School Administrators and the California County Superintendents Educational Services Association are supporting this measure contingent on amendments that language be included that requires ongoing BTSA program approval and some form of protection for BTSA funding to ensure that the current funding structure (funding going to local education agencies versus individual districts) is maintained.

## Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends a “Seek Amendments” position on the bill to remove reference to the Para Program, the Pre-Intern Program, the Intern Program and BTSA.

## Reasons for Suggested Position

1. **The proposal treats teacher preparation and staff development as one in the same:** The proposal does not distinguish between teacher preparation programs which satisfy State requirements for licensure and staff development programs which reflect locally determined needs for additional professional development. The charge, locus of responsibility and needs of the intended recipients are very different in these two program categories.

Teacher preparation programs prepare new teachers through multiple routes of standards-based preparation culminating in *state* certification. These new teachers need preliminary training in such areas as classroom management, instructional theory, teaching methods, child and adolescent development and working effectively with parents. This is training necessary to receive their preliminary *state* certification.

With staff development programs, the focus shifts to *local* needs and requirements of school districts and personal growth goals of individual teachers. In staff development programs, new teachers build on the initial knowledge and skills gained in their teacher preparation program and focus on the special requirements of their *local* school districts and student populations.

2. **The proposal may delay state certification for some candidates, diminish alternative routes to the profession and in general reduce the ability for the state to achieve statewide policy goals:** The bill does not address whether a district must provide all of the block granted programs or ascribe a funding priority for those programs that fulfill state requirements. For example, could a district decide not to offer a BTSA program? If so, candidates that must meet an induction requirement for professional clear certification may find that they are unable to meet this state requirement. Similarly, if a district decided to use Intern funds for another purpose (within the scope of the grant), funding that would ordinarily be allocated only to those districts that promoted alternative routes would be reduced and the state objective of providing multiple routes to the teaching profession would be diminished.
3. **The proposal separates funding from accountability:** A block grant is an entitlement through which the recipient is issued funds for certain purposes and

under certain guidelines, but is not subject to program submission or approval. By separating the funding (through the issuance of block grants to local districts) from the program standards and authorizing documents (which would remain the responsibility of the Commission), the proposal sets up the scenario whereby the Commission would be issuing authorizing documents without any knowledge of local program quality or accountability. While the Academic Performance Index (API) is a measure of local district accountability, it does not provide any measurement that ties back to teacher preparation.

4. **The Commission has already acted to streamline program administration:** Recognizing the close association between the Pre-Intern and Intern Programs, both from a funding perspective (authorized by SB 1666) and an administrative one, the Commission has for some time accepted joint proposals from school districts. These joint submissions have been widely accepted in the field with many programs submitting a single Request For Proposal for both Intern and Pre-Intern programs. In addition, continuing programs in good standing can respond by providing an “update” of their existing program.
5. **Funding for Emergency Permit holders is inconsistent with the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB):** The State is currently in the process of developing a plan to comply with the NCLB requirement to have a “highly qualified” teacher in all classrooms by the 2005-06 school year. While the State plan is not yet complete, we do know that emergency permit teachers will not be considered “highly qualified”. This measure proposed to provide \$1,500 for each emergency permit holder. It is questionable whether providing funding for emergency permit teachers would align with the State’s plan to comply with NCLB.



## **Bill Analysis**

### **California Commission on Teacher Credentialing**

<b>Bill Number:</b>	<b>Senate Bill 510</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Senator Figueroa</b>
<b>Sponsor:</b>	<b>Salvadorian--American Leadership Education Fund and California Teachers Association</b>
<b>Subject of Bill:</b>	<b>Teacher Exchange Program</b>
<b>Date Introduced:</b>	<b>February 20, 2003</b>
<b>Status in Leg. Process:</b>	<b>Senate Rules Committee</b>
<b>Recommended Position:</b>	<b>Watch</b>
<b>Date of Analysis:</b>	<b>April 29, 2003</b>
<b>Analyst:</b>	<b>Anne L. Padilla</b>

#### **Summary of Current Law**

Education Code Sections 44610 – 44617 establishes the *Foreign Language Teacher Exchange and Recruitment Law*. The purpose of this law is to: 1) encourage the temporary exchange of teachers between California school districts and schools in foreign countries; and 2) to make available to California schools and teachers, foreign-born persons and others who are especially qualified to provide instruction in one or more foreign languages so that students can receive foreign language instruction. The State Board of Education and the Department of Education are charged with administering this program.

Education Code Section 44615 requires the Commission to adopt rules and regulations concerning the issuance of special credentials in the teaching of a foreign language to foreign-born persons or others having the native fluency in a modern foreign language to teach foreign language in the public schools.

#### **Summary of Current Activity by the Commission**

The Commission issues Sojourn credentials to persons recommended by a local governing board who meet the following minimum requirements:

- Transcripts, certificates, or other evidence of education above US high school level (or equivalent) and at least 90 semester units of college level study (or equivalent);

- Verification that the applicant was employed as a teacher during the calendar year immediately preceding the date of application;
- Certification by the local governing board that the applicant is a bilingual-biliterate teacher fluent both in English and the target language and employed, as specified;
- Certification of the local governing board that the applicant will be employed by the school district in a teaching assignment authorized by a Sojourn certificated employee credential and that the applicant has been informed in writing of his or her employment status and renewal requirements;
- A written statement signed by the applicant verifying knowledge of the general requirements for regular credential and agreement to diligently pursue completion of the specified requirements;
- Passage of the California Basic Educational Skills Test (CBEST);
- Meets fitness requirements, as specified.

This credential authorizes the holder to provide bilingual instruction, foreign language instruction, or cultural enrichment in the elementary and/or secondary grades of the employing school district in the subjects in which the applicant is academically competent to teach. The credential is issued initially for two years and may be renewed one year at a time for no more than a total of five one-year periods, upon completion of renewal requirements.

The Commission issues approximately 35 Sojourn credentials annually.

### **Analysis of Bill Provisions**

This measure, a “spot bill,” declares legislative intent that the Legislature establish a teacher exchange pilot program between California and El Salvador that would allow a teacher from El Salvador to teach in California if he or she possess a baccalaureate degree in the subject to be taught from an accredited college or university in the United States or the Universidad de El Salvador and if he or she passes the CBEST.

### **Analysis of Fiscal Impact of Bill**

The bill does not address the administration or funding for the pilot program.

### **Analysis of Relevant Legislative Policies by the Commission**

The following Legislative policies apply to this measure:

**6. The Commission supports alternatives to existing credential requirements that maintain high standards for the preparation of educators, and opposes alternatives that do not provide sufficient assurances of quality.**

### **Organizational Positions on the Bill**

Sponsors: Salvadorian--American Leadership Education Fund and California Teachers Association

**Suggested Position**

Staff recommends a “watch” position on SB 510.

**Reason for Suggested Position**

As this bill only describes legislative intent, staff is recommending a “watch” position at this time.



